

REMARKS

Claims 2,3,6,8,12,13,15,16, and 18-23 were withdrawn . Claims 14-17 were cancelled. Claims 1,5,7,9-11, and 14 were rejected based on *Mara* in view of *Stand Alone Spinning Wing Chun Dummy*.

Objections to Drawings

The OA states that reference character “10” lacks a lead line in Fig. 1. Reference Character “10” refers to the whole training device in Fig. 1 (see page 7, line 24) and does not require a lead line.

The “kit”, claims 14 – 17 have been cancelled, so no new drawing is now required. The two opposed cup structures, each structure including a hollow cylinder closed at one end by a curved surface (claim 4) are already shown on Figure 3, reference numbers 216 and 218. The confusion with respect to these parts is that their reference in the specification was reversed (see page 10, line 10, part 216 should be 218).

Objections to the Specification

The specification has been amended. The recitation of “216” on page 10, line 10, should indeed be “218” as noted in the OA.

The two opposed structures are 216 and 218. 218 is press fit over fixed shaft 204. Structure 216 is attached to rotating shaft 206 by fasteners 217. The hollow cylinder is the small unreferenced section above the curved surface on parts 216 and 218. In part 218 it is the section that is press fit over shaft 204. In part 216 it is the section which is attached to rotating shaft 206 by fasteners 217. Applicant believes the revised specification is now correct.

Claims Rejections under 35 USC § 103

Claims 1, 5, 7, 9-11 and 14 were rejected over *Mara* in view of *Stand Alone Spinning Wing Chun Dummy*. *Mara* does not disclose a rotary bearing supported by the base, the

rotary bearing supporting the elongate shaft at an end thereof such that the shaft is capable of 360° rotation (claim elements 1c and 1d) The OA relies on *Stand Alone Spinning Wing Chun Dummy* for 360° rotation (claim element 1c and 1d). However the *Stand Alone Spinning Wing Chun Dummy* is not capable of 360° rotation, but rather if one is facing the crooked wooden leg it rotates at most 90° in each direction (clockwise or counter-clockwise) and then springs back due to its construction “seeming to strike back”. It does not rotate freely in a full circle (360°) like the applicant’s invention. (See Appendix 1, a 37 CFR 1.132 declaration by the Applicant so stating)

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations (*In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974) and MPEP 2142). The prior art fails to teach a rotary bearing supported by the base, the rotating bearing supporting the elongate shaft at an end thereof such that the shaft is capable of 360°, therefore the OA does not establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

For this reason, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 1, 5, 7, and 9-11 be reconsidered, and all of these claims plus claim 4 (already allowable subject matter) be allowed and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued.

Respectfully Submitted,

/Howard E. Lebowitz/

Foothill Law Group, LLP
Howard E. Lebowitz
Registration Number 44,864
Attorney of Record
19682 Hesperian Blvd., Suite 208
Hayward, CA 94541
510-785-8070